

46. (Amended) The machine readable code as recited in claim 34, further comprising:
machine readable code for instantiating a chat function to thereby permit communication
between the users; and
machine readable code for storing a White Board session synchronized with the
communications between the users in a White Board session file.

REMARKS

Claims 1-77 are pending in the application. In the Amendment claims 34, 39, 41-44, and 46 are amended as discussed in detail below. A copy of these claims, without underlining and bracketing, appear in the attached Appendix.

The Office Action rejects claims 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 4-7 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,777. However, the Office Action tacitly admits that the features recited in claim 39-47 patentably distinguish over the cited claims of the '777 patent. In the Amendment, claim 34 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of originally filed claim 39, while claim 39 is amended to recite features previously disclosed but unclaimed in the application. Claims 41-44 and 46 are amended to conform to the language of amended claim 34.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 34 renders the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 34-38 moot. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 34-38.

The Office Action rejects claims 21, 25, 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460. It is respectfully submitted that the first Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto renders the rejection moot. For that reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection regarding claims 21, 25, and 35.

The Office Action also rejects claims 22-24 and 26-30 under the judicially created doctrine

of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 10-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460. It is respectfully submitted that the first Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto also renders the rejection moot. For that reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection regarding claims 22-24 and 26-30.

The Office Action further rejects claims 31 and 48 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,777. It is respectfully submitted that the second Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto likewise renders the rejection moot. For that reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection regarding claims 31 and 48.

Finally, the Office Action further rejects claims 32, 33, 49, and 52 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2, 3, 19, 20, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,777. It is respectfully submitted that the second Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto also renders the rejection moot. For that reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection regarding claims 32, 33, 49, and 52.

The Office Action then rejects claims 1-6, 13-14, 20-22, 27-30, 34-37, 48-53, 55-58, 63-64, 66-68, 72, and 74-77 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aditham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,001) in view of Kumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,906). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It well settled that 35 U.S.C. §103 authorizes a rejection where to meet the claim, it is necessary to modify a single reference or to combine it with one or more other references. After indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. §103, the examiner should set forth in the Office action (1) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate, (2) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s), (3) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and (4) an explanation why such proposed modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made. See M.P.E.P. §706.02(j).

Independent claim 1 positively recites:

A method facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users of incompatible hardware and/or operating systems, comprising:

selectively generating predetermined objects, text objects, active hyperlink objects, active track objects, freehand drawing objects, images and 3D images which are displayable at user-selected locations on a White Board screen of one of the users;

transmitting all generated ones of the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images and the 3D images for selective distributions to each of the other users; and

filtering the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images and the 3D images to thereby permit selective retransmission of the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images and the 3D images to respective ones of the other users.

The Office Action states that a single paragraph in the '001 patent teaches all of the limitations of the recited method but for various ones of the recited objects; the '906 patent is enlisted to show the missing elements. The paragraph allegedly providing the clearly recited method steps of claim 1 is set forth immediately below.

"In accordance with one aspect of the invention, a collaborative session is represented by a session object which receives all messages generated by the programs and transmits the messages to all programs participating in the session. The session object can include shared objects which are managed by the session and can be updated without requiring messages to be transmitted over a network. Accordingly, programs may enter a session after it begins and immediately access common session information, such as a state database." See U.S. Patent No. 6,378,001 at col. 2, lines 21-30.

The '001 patent teaches a collaborative system by which multiple users can share resources such as a database, e.g., a database of stock prices. See col. 1, lines 16-16. The collaborative system taught by the '001 patent permits users to establish a private session. See col. 5, lines 14-57. It will be appreciated from the teachings of the '001 patent that all of the users receive the same information

(users in a public session) unless two of the users establish a private session, whereby only these users in the private session can communicate with one another. There is simply no teaching in the four corners of the '001 patent of a step of "filtering the ... objects, the images, and the 3D images to thereby permit selective retransmission of the ... objects, the images and the 3D images to respective ones of the other users.

As discussed on page 30 of the above-identified application,

"Numeral 1012 denotes the above-mentioned chat room or board. Preferably, this chat room provides multi-level security filtering for text and other White Board data. As discussed above, each user has a predetermined privilege; the user may communicate with all users at the lowest common privilege setting or communicate only with those users that have an equal or higher privilege level by selecting one of the available privilege levels from the pull down menu on the White Board. This permits a subgroup of higher privilege users to pass information and comments between themselves while the lower privilege users outside the subgroup remain unaware that information is being passed. It should be mentioned that White Board client 301a advantageously can communicate with White Board client 301b via the White Board server 102, in an exemplary case, by selecting the user of White Board client 301b from the user list. It will be appreciated that chat messages between these users will be sent at the lowest common privilege level. "

Thus, the recited filtering step is clearly not the public and private sessions taught by the '001 patent.

Moreover, the '906 patent is not cited as teaching, and does not teach, the filtering step set forth in claim 1. The '906 patent is merely cited as teach various objects not explicitly taught in the '001 patent.

In short, since neither the '001 patent nor the '906 patent teach or suggest the filtering step clearly recited in claim 1, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claim 1 obvious. Claims 2-6, depending from independent claim 1, are allowable over the combination of references on identical reasoning.

The Office Action rejects claim 13 in view of the same combination, and relies on the '001 patent as teaching, for example, the steps of generating the server. However, independent claim 13, as admitted in the Office Action, contains a filtering step of "filtering the ... objects, the images, and

the 3D images to thereby permit the White Board server to selectively relay the ... objects, the images, and the 3D images to the second White Board client."

Thus, as mentioned above, since neither the '001 patent nor the '906 patent teach or suggest the filtering step clearly recited in claim 13, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claim 13 obvious. Claims 14 and 20, depending from independent claim 13, are allowable over the combination of references on identical reasoning.

Claim 21 positively recites that "the server selectively controls transmission of all user-generated objects to respective ones of the computers responsive to the respective assigned identifier. Moreover, claim 25 recites that "the primary server selectively transmits the user-generated objects to respective ones of the computers responsive to the respective privilege level," while claim 34 (as amended) recites "a White Board server which operatively couples the first and the second White Board clients to one another, which selectively relays the first and the second objects between the second and the first White Board clients, respectively, responsive to the first and second privilege levels, and which stores a White Board session in a White Board session file."

Claim 48 positively recites "a second memory storing second machine readable code generating a White Board server which operatively couples the first and the second White Board clients to one another, and which selectively relays the first and the second objects between the second and the first White Board clients, respectively, responsive to the first and second indicia." Furthermore, claim 56 positively recites a method including a step for "filtering the commands regarding the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images and the 3D images to thereby permit selective fetching of the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images and the 3D images by respective ones of the other users." Claim 63 also positively recites a step for "filtering the commands associated with the predetermined, the active hyperlink, the text, the active track, and the freehand drawing objects, the images, and the 3D images to thereby permit the White Board server to selectively relay the filtered commands to the second White Board client." Claim 67 positively recites that "the server selectively controls transmission of the commands to respective

ones of the computers responsive to the respective assigned identifier" and that "the client computers selectively fetch respective ones of the user-generated objects responsive to the received commands." Finally, claim 72 positively recites that "the primary server selectively transmits the user-generated objects to respective ones of the computers responsive to the respective privilege level and commands from the respective ones of the computers."

Thus, each of the independent claims positively recite a method or feature permitting selective filtering of user generated objects, as discussed above. However, since neither the '001 patent nor the '906 patent teach or suggest the limitation of claims 21, 25, 31, 48, 56, 63, 67, and 72 reproduced above, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claims 21, 25, 31, 34, 48, 56, 63, 67, and 72 obvious. The rejected claims depending from independent claims 21, 25, 31, 34, 48, 56, 63, 67, and 72 are allowable over the combination of references on identical reasoning.

The Office Action next rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '001 patent in view of the '906 patent and further in view of Smythe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,214). The '214 patent is cited as teaching that a client device can be shut down responsive to a received command signal. However, the 214 patent is not cite as teaching the filtering step positively recited in claim 1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that since none of the '001 patent, the '906 patent, nor the '214 patent teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1, reproduced above, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claim 1 obvious. Claim 7, depending from independent claim 1, is allowable over the combination of references for all of the reasons set forth above.

The Office Action also rejects claims 8-12, 15-19, 23-24, 38-40, 45-47, 54, 60-62, and 69-70 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '001 patent in view of the '906 patent and further in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991). The '991 patent is cited as teaching many of the limitations found in the '001 patent; however, the '991 patent is not cited as teaching a filtering step or structure or code permitting selective transmission of user generated objects by a server. This

rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that since none of the '001 patent, the '906 patent, nor the '991 patent teach or suggest the limitation of claims 1, 13, 21, 34, 48, 56, and 67 reproduced above, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claims 1, 13, 21, 34, 48, 56, and 67 obvious. The rejected claims depending from independent claims 1, 13, 21, 34, 48, 56, and 67 are allowable over the combination of references on identical reasoning.

The Office Action further rejects claims 26, 59, 65, 71, and 73 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '001 patent in view of the '906 patent and further in view of Raz (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,827). The '827 patent is cited as teaching the use of multiple servers for redundancy; however, the '827 patent is not cited as teaching a filtering step or structure or code permitting selective transmission of user generated objects by a server. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that since none of the '001 patent, the '906 patent, nor the '827 patent teach or suggest the limitation of claims 25, 56, 63, 67, and 72, reproduced above, no possible combination of the applied references could possibly render the invention of claims 25, 56, 63, 67, and 72 obvious. The rejected claims depending from independent claims 25, 56, 63, 67, and 72, i.e., claims 26, 59, 65, 71, and 73, are allowable over the combination of references on identical reasoning.

The Office Action then rejects claims 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '001 patent in view of the '906 patent and further in view of an article by Jacobs. The Office Action cites but, does not specifically apply Pizano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,055) and Honda (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,885). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 31 is drawn to "machine readable code stored in memory for converting a general purpose computer system into a dedicated White Board system facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users, the machine readable code generating ... a filter device connecting all of the users and permitting selective transmission of the objects to the users."

As mentioned above, since neither the '001 patent nor the '906 patent teach machine readable code for generating the filter specifically recited in claim 31, no possible combination of these references could render the invention of claim 31 obvious. Moreover, since none of the additional

references cited in paragraph 49 of the Office Action teach or suggest this limitation, and are not cited as teaching such a filter device, no possible combination of the five cited references could render claim 31 obvious. Claim 32-33 are allowable for all of the reasons set forth above.

Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '001 patent in view of the '906 patent and the '991 patent and further in view of Howell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,901). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously mentioned, independent claim 34 (as amended) recites "machine readable code stored in memory for converting a general purpose computer system into a dedicated White Board system facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users, the machine readable code generating ... a White Board server which operatively couples the first and the second White Board clients to one another, which selectively relays the first and the second objects between the second and the first White Board clients, respectively, responsive to the first and second privilege levels, and which stores a White Board session in a White Board session file."

As discussed above, since neither the '001 patent nor the '906 patent teach machine readable code for generating the White Board server positively recited in claim 34, no possible combination of these references could render the invention of claim 34 obvious. Moreover, addition of the '991 patent to the combination would not render the invention of claim 34 obvious since all of the users of system taught by the '991 receive identical information. The addition of the '901 patent teaches away from the invention recited in claim 34, since the proposed combination would result in a collaboration system where a single user with a high privilege level could receive an object or file from a partitioned storage, thus permitting everyone in the public session to see the object regardless of their respective privilege levels.


For all of the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 41-44.

In light of the amendments and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited.

By this response, Applicant has made a sincere effort to place this case in final condition for

allowance. However, if it is deemed that there still remain additional issues to be resolved, the Examiner is encouraged to call the Applicant's undersigned representative prior to taking any further formal action in this case.

Respectfully submitted,


Matthew J. Bussan
Reg. No. 33,614
Phone: (540) 653-8061

Attachments:

Appendix

Two Terminal Disclaimers

Date: June 26, 2003

Navy Case No: 79260

APPENDIX

34. Machine readable code stored in memory for converting a general purpose computer system into a dedicated White Board system facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users, the machine readable code generating:

a first White Board client which instantiates first objects having an associated first privilege level;

a second White Board client which instantiates second objects having an associated second privilege level;

a web server which transmits portions of the machine readable code generating the first and the second White Board clients; and

a White Board server which operatively couples the first and the second White Board clients to one another, which selectively relays the first and the second objects between the second and the first White Board clients, respectively, responsive to the first and second privilege levels, and which stores a White Board session in a White Board session file.

39. The machine readable code as recited in claim 34, wherein the machine readable code for storing the White Board session in the White Board session file records all of the first and second objects and their respective first and second privilege levels.

41. The machine readable code as recited in claim 39, wherein the machine readable code for storing is responsive to privilege level of a respective user to thereby save only that portion of the White Board session having a corresponding privilege level.

42. The machine readable code as recited in claim 39, wherein the machine readable code for storing saves the White Board session and information indicative of the privilege level of the White Board session.

43. The machine readable code as recited in claim 39, wherein the machine readable code for storing saves the White Board session irrespective of privilege level.

44. The machine readable code as recited in claim 39, wherein the machine readable code for storing saves selected portions of the White Board sessions having a privilege level less than or equal a selected privilege level.

46. The machine readable code as recited in claim 34, further comprising:
machine readable code for instantiating a chat function to thereby permit communication between the users; and

machine readable code for storing a White Board session synchronized with the communications between the users in a White Board session file.